Status Of Application

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,190,172 to Lechner ("Lechner").

Claims 7, 8, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lechner in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,579,026 to Yamazaki et al ("Yamazaki").

Drawings

The indication in the Final Office Action that a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review has been considered when the Application is in condition for allowability, is noted with appreciation.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

The rejection of claims 1-6, 9-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lechner, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

The Lechner patent shows a visual display system. This provides multiple screens (12, 14, 16, 18) to surround the user to provide a total immersion effect. A projector 28 is provided for each screen (column 6, lines 65-67). Each projector is a separate display device (column 7, lines 9-20). The screens may have an **aspect ratio of 4:3 or 3:4** (column 8, lines 10-36). **The aspect ratio is the ratio of the width of the screen to the height of the screen**. For each type of aspect ratio, **one projector is used for each screen.** (column 8, lines 27-36).

In contrast to the cited prior art, claim 1 includes:

> at least one display device for displaying the images that are to be projected onto the screens, a **total number of display devices being smaller than a total number of screens** ...

The rejection states that Lechner shows "a total number of display devices being smaller than a total number of screens (see column 8, lines 15-22, because the width of the displayed video image on each side screen is less that the height of the displayed video image)." This statement is nonsensical. The width and height of the screens has absolutely no bearing on the number of screens in relation to the number of projectors. It is very clear that there is no teaching in the Lechner patent other than using one projector for each screen. Thus, the total number of display devices is equal to the total number of screens in the Lechner patent.

The portion of Lechner Patent cited in the quoted part of the rejection above states:

> In one embodiment, the first predetermined aspect ratio of the front screen is greater than one. Thus, the width of the displayed video image is greater than the height of the displayed video image. Typically, the first predetermined aspect ratio is 4:3. In this embodiment, the second predetermined aspect ratio of each side screen is preferably less than 1. Thus, the width of the displayed video image on each side screen is less than the height of the displayed video image.

This quote says absolutely nothing about the ratio of the total number of projectors to the total number of screens. It only makes a statement about the height and width of the screens used. Shortly after the above quoted material, the Lechner patent states at column 8, lines 25-32:

> The aspect ratio is determined, at least in part, by the video projector 28 which projects the video image to be displayed on the respective display screen 12. Therefore, in one embodiment, **the video projector which is associated with the front screen 14** has a predetermined aspect ratio of 4:3 while **the video projector which is associated with each respective side screen 18** has a predetermined aspect ratio of 3:4.

Thus, one projector is used for each screen. It is very clear that the only configuration envisioned in the Lechner patent is one projector (28) for each display screen (12), as is clearly shown from the above quote and in Figure 4. In Figure 5, four projectors (28) are used with four screens (front screen 14, upper screen 16, and first and second side screens 18). In Figures 6-8, six projectors (28) are used with six screens (front screen 14, first and second front side screens 18, first and second rear side screens 20 and rear upper screen 22). Therefore, the cited reference only shows a configuration where the number of display devices is equal to the number of screens.

The cited reference does not show or suggest an image display system where the "**total number of display devices**" is "**smaller than a total number of screens**" (*i.e.*, the total number of display devices is less than the total number of screens). To anticipate, a reference must show, expressly or inherently, every limitation of the claim. MPEP §2131. Therefore, the cited prior art does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-6, 9 and 10 are dependent upon claim 1 and thus include every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-6, 9 and 10 are also not anticipated by the cite prior art.

Also in contrast to the cited prior art, claim 11 includes,

> a step of installing at least one display device for displaying the images that are to be projected onto the screens, a total number of display devices being smaller than a total number of screens

As noted above, the cited prior art does not show or suggest the use of a total number of display devices that is smaller than the total number of screens. Therefore, the cited prior art does not anticipate claim 11. Claims 12-17, 19 and 20 are dependent upon claim 11 and thus include every limitation of claim 11. Therefore, claims 12-17, 19 and 20 are also not anticipated by the cited prior art.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lechner, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The rejection of claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Lechner in view of Yamazaki, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

The Yamazaki patent shows a system whereby viewers may view different images on the same display. A monitor 11 shows a display image that is interleaved in time (Figure 2). The viewers wear special glasses (13 and 14) that include LCD shutters. The shutter on a first pair of glasses is timed to correspond to a first image displayed by the monitor and the shutter of the second pair of glasses is timed to correspond to a second image. In this way, the viewer wearing the first pair of glasses only sees the first image and the viewer wearing the second pair of glasses only sees the second image.

To demonstrate a *prima facie* case for obviousness, every limitation of the claim must be shown or suggested in the combined references. MPEP §2143. As noted above, the Lechner patent does not show or suggest a system having a smaller number of display devices than the number of screens. The Yamazaki patent also does not show or suggest this limitation. Claims 7 and 8 are dependent upon claim 1 and thus include every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, the cited prior art does not show or suggest every element of claims 7 and 8. Claims 17 and 18 are dependent upon claim 11 and thus include every limitation of claim 11. Therefore, the cited prior art does not show or suggest every limitation of claims 17 and 18. Thus, the cited prior art does not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness and thus claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 are non-obvious.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lechner in view of Yamazaki, be reconsidered and withdrawn.